BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adorno, T. W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Agger, Robert, Goldrich, Daniel, and Swanson, Bert. The Rulers and The Ruled. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Allport, Gordon. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1938.

Ardrey, Robert. African Genesis. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1961.

Ayers, Alfred Jules. Language, Truth and Logic. New York: Dover Press, 1946.

Bass, Bernard. Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Bijou, Sidney, and Baer, Donald. Child Development. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Braybrooke, David, and Lindblom, Charles. A Strategy of Decision. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Brunswick, Egon. Perception and the Representative Design in Psychological Experiments. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

Bucklew, John. Paradigms of Psychopathology. Chicago: J. P. Lippincott, 1960.

Bugelski, B. R. The Psychology of Learning Applied to Teaching. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

Bullock, Alan. Hitler: A Study in Tyranny. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Cannon, W. B. Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear, and Rage. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1929.

Carlson, Anton, and Johnson, Victor. The Machinery of the Human Body. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Cattell, Raymond B. Personality and Motivation Structure and Measurement. Yonkers-on-the-Hudson: World Book Company, 1957.

Cooper, Joseph D. The Art of Decision-Making. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.

Dahl, Robert. A Preface to Democratic Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

_____. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

_____, and Lindblom, Charles. Politics, Economics and Welfare. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Davies, James. Human Nature in Politics. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1963.

Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Easton, David. The Political System. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Edwards, Allen. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Eisenstadt, S. N. The Absorption of Immigrants. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950.

Etzioni, Amitia. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Foster, George M. Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Fuller, John L. Motivation: A Biological Perspective. New York: Random House, 1962.

Gerth, Hans H., and Mills, C. Wright. From Max Weber. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Goffman, Irving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Anchor, 1959.

Harding, Thomas, Kaplan, David, Sahlins, Marshall, and Service, Elman. Evolution and Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Hart, H. Liddell. Strategy. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1964.

Hebb, D. O. The Organization of Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1945.

Heisenberg, Werner. The Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Homans, George Casper. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Horney, Karen. The Neurotic Personality in Our Time. New York: W. W. Norton, 1937.

Hull, Clark L. Principles of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.

Inhelder, Bärbel, and Piaget, Jean. The Growth of Logical Thinking. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Jennings, Eugene E. The Executive. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Keller, Suzanne. Beyond the Ruling Class: Strategic Elites in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1963.

Klapper, Joseph T. The Effects of Mass Communication. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Kornhauser, William. The Politics of Mass Society. New York: Free Press, 1959.

Lane, Robert. Political Ideology. New York: Free Press, 1962.

_____, and Sears, David. Public Opinion. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Lasswell, Harold. Psychopathology and Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

_____. Power and Personality. New York: W. W. Norton, 1948.

_____, and Kaplan, Abraham. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

_____. Politics: Who Gets What, When and How? New York: Meridian, 1960.

Lewin, Kurt. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

March, James, and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1955.

Marx, Melvin, and Hillix, William. Systems and Theories in Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

McClelland, David C. Personality. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951.

_____, et al. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McCord, William and Joan. The Psychopath. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

McEwen, William. The Problem of Social Scientific Knowledge. Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1963.

Merton, Robert. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Mitchell, William C. The American Polity. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Murray, Henry, et al. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Organski, A. F. K. The Stages of Political Development. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Neustadt, Richard. Presidential Power. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1960.

Piaget, Jean. Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood. New York: W. W. Norton, 1951.

_____. The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Basic Books, 1954.

_____. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. New York: International University Press, 1954.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

_____. The Three Christs of Ypsilanti: A Narrative Study of Three Lost Men. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Schattschneider, E. E. The Semi-Sovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Skinner, B. F. The Behavior of Organisms: An Experimental Analysis. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1938.

_____. Science and Human Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Snedecor, George. Statistical Methods. Ames: State University of Iowa Press, 1956.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. Social and Cultural Mobility. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Thorndike, Edward Lee. The Fundamentals of Learning. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Thucydides. The Peloponnesian Wars. New York: Modern Library, 1951.

Wahlke, John C., Eulau, Heinz, Buchanan, William, and Ferguson, LeRoy. The Legislative System. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Wiener, Norbert. Cybernetics. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1962.

Articles

Allport, Gordon, and Faden, James. "The Psychology of Newspapers: Five Tentative Laws," Public Opinion Quarterly, IV (1940).

Almond, Gabriel. "A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics," The Politics of Developing Areas, ed. Gabriel Almond and James Coleman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Carnap, Rudolph. "Formal and Factual Science," Readings in the Philosophy of Science, ed. Herbert Feigl and May Brodbeck. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Clausen, John A. "Mental Disorders," Contemporary Social Problems, ed. Robert Merton and Robert Nisbet. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Cohen, Arthur S. "Some Implications of Self-Esteem for Social Influence," Personality and Persuasibility, ed. Irving Janis and Carl Hovland. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Cohn, T. S. "The Relation of the F Scale to a Response to Answer Positively," The American Psychologist, VIII (1953).

Cyert, R. M., Dill, R. W., and March, J. G. "The Role of Expectation in Business Decision-Making," The Making of Decisions: A Reader in Administrative Behavior, ed. William Gore and J. W. Dyson. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Dahl, Robert. "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, III (1957).

Doman, Glenn, and Delacato, Carl. "Train Your Baby to Be a Genius," McCall's Magazine (March, 1965).

Elkins, Stanley. "Slavery and Personality," Studying Personality Cross-Culturally, ed. Bert Kaplan. Evanston: Row and Peterson, 1960.

Erikson, Erik H. "The Problem of Ego Identity," Identity and Anxiety, ed. Maurice Stein, Arthur Vidich and David White. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Feigl, Herbert. "Notes on Causality," Readings in the Philosophy of Science, ed. Herbert Feigl and May Brodbeck. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Gibb, Cecil. "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Lindzey. Volume II. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1956.

Hollingshead, August, and Redlich, Frederick. "Social Stratification and Psychiatric Disorders," Behavior Disorders, ed. Ohmer Milton. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott, 1965.

Harlow, Harry. "The Nature of Love," The American Psychologist, XIII (1958).

_____, and Margaret. "The Effect of Rearing Conditions of Behavior," Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, XXVI (1962).

Hempel, Carl. "Fundamentals of Concept Formation in Empirical Science," International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, II, Vol. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Jaffe, Natalie. "Research Traces Schizoid Thought," The New York Times, November 21, 1965.

Kennedy, John F. "President John F. Kennedy Discusses the Presidency," The Dynamics of the American Presidency, ed. Jack Walker and Donald Johnson. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1964.

Krasner, Leonard. "Studies of the Conditioning of Verbal Behavior," Psychological Bulletin, LV (1958).

Kubzansky, Philip E. "The Effects of Reduced Environmental Stimulation on Human Behavior: A Review," The Manipulation of Human Behavior, ed. A. Bidderman and H. Zimmer. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1961.

Lenzen, Victor F. "Procedures of Empirical Science," International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, I, No. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Linton, Harriet, and Graham, Elaine. "Personality Correlates of Persuasibility," Personality and Persuasibility, ed. Irving Janis and Carl Hovland. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Maslow, Abraham H. "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review, L (1943).

"Managing Your People," published by Nation's Business, New York, 1965.

Miller, Neal, and Bugelski, Richard. "Minor Studies in Aggression: The Influence of Frustration Imposed by the In-Group on Attitudes Toward Out-Groups," Journal of Psychology, XXV (1948).

Olds, James S. "Hypothalamic Substrates of Reward," Physiology Review, XLII (1962).

Ostrom, Vincent. "Culture, Science and Politics," The Making of Decisions: A Reader in Administrative Behavior, ed. William Gore and J. W. Dyson. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Pitelka, F. A., Tomich, D. Q., and Treichel, G. W. "Ecological Relations of Jaegers and Owls as Lemming Predators Near Barrow, Alaska," Ecological Monographs, XXV (1955).

Rogow, Arnold, and Lasswell, Harold. "Game and Gain Politicians," Political Leadership in American Government, ed. James Barber. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.

Sanford, Nevitt. "The Approach of the Authoritarian Personality," Psychology of Personality, ed. J. L. McCary. New York: Grove Press, 1959.

Scott, J. P. "The Process of Socialization in Canine and Human Infants," Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. XXVIII, 1963, No. 1.

Sears, Robert. "Experimental Studies of Projection," Journal of Social Psychology, VII (1936).

Sidey, Hugh. "Two Years in Office: Measure of the Man," Life Magazine, December 5, 1965.

Snyder, Richard, and Paige, Glenn. "The United States Decision to Resist Aggression in Korea: The Application of an Analytical Scheme," Administrative Science Quarterly, III (1958).

Spiro, Melford. "Social Systems, Personality and Functional Analysis," Studying Personality Cross-Culturally, ed. Bert Kaplan. Evanston: Row and Peterson, 1961.

Spitz, R. A. "The Role of Ecological Factors in Emotional Development in Infancy," Child Development, XX (1949).

Stein, Morris I. "Exploration in Typology," The Study of Lives, ed. Robert W. White. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

White, Robert W. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," The Psychological Review, LXVI (1959).

Winch, Robert F., and Ktsanes, Thomas and Virginia. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: An Analytic and Descriptive Study," The American Sociological Review, XIX (1954).

Wrong, Dennis. "The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology," Personality and Social Systems, ed. Neil and William Smelser. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1963.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY SCHEDULE

The ultimate test of any scientific theory is the correspondence of observable phenomena to predicted relationships, when the observations have been drawn according to the authoritative criteria of the scientific method. The encapsulated character of all scientific activity automatically assures that reality can never be accurately represented; and, what a theory tells us about reality will be no more accurate than the constructs used to represent the constituents or variables of the theory. This includes the reliability and validity of the measurements that operationally stand for the abstract constructs of the theory. As indicated previously, many of the scales used to represent the constructs of the theory have not been tested for either reliability or validity. The major reason for this is the exploratory nature of the study, in which two models have been successively derived from the implications of a hypothetical integrated theory of human behavior. The provisional nature of each of the models

does not warrant concern for scientific rigor, even though statistical techniques were employed to test parts of each model. Probably the most serious shortcoming of the study is the lack of intersubjective testability in coding many of the open-ended scales. It seems highly plausible that another coder, possessing different values and cognitions, might have come to different conclusions about responses. Ideally, a panel of experts should have been employed, and only those items used that indicated the highest intercoder reliability. Generalization to other frames of reference from this study, especially when the theory to be tested has been constructed on such shaky conceptual measurements, would be both dangerous and irresponsible. The study has been the product of one mind, of a single setting, executed with limited analytic and scientific tools. It is suggestive, perhaps even insightful, but hardly definitive. No extravagant claims are made for it.

The operational measures of the leading constructs of the theory posed almost insurmountable problems. Most of the concepts were artifacts of a new theory, for which there were no existing measures. The indicators had to be manufactured from wholecloth without the benefit of the practiced wisdom of professionals. Suffice it to say that

my attempts at operational definition and measurement yielded questionable results. While some of the scales are the product of scalogram analysis, in which a coefficient of reproducibility was derived, no tests for reliability were performed. The total lack of independent measures makes it necessary for this work to beg the question of construct validity. Both tasks are more appropriately the province of future research.

1. Reinforcement Need. The need for reinforcement has been measured by a modified Persuasibility Scale and an Involvement Scale. The Involvement Scale was developed by the author, while the Persuasibility Scale was adapted from a similar scale developed by the Yale Communication and Attitude Change Program, and reported by Hovland and Janis, et al., in Personality and Persuasibility.[1] My argument is that a reinforcement need has at least two components. The first is a high salience of primitive beliefs, which may be measured by the importance of moral involvement. The second is field dependence, which is measurable by persuasibility. The more morally involved, the higher the

---

[1] Hovland and Janis, Appendix B.

salience of primitive beliefs; the more persuasible, the more field dependent. By combining the two, we have, at least on the surface, an adequate measure of reinforcement need.

The researchers of the Yale Study found that, with respect to a general personality disposition called persuasibility, people fall into three empirical groups: changers (who are field dependent), non-changers (who are field independent) and negative changers (who are field independent, but unlike the non-changer, are totally resistant to persuasion). For purposes of this study, the changer represents the person with a high reinforcement need. Hovland and Janis also report that changers had a higher need for social approval and security, a higher respect for parental authority, a greater admiration for power, were more anti-intraceptive and harsher in their condemnation of social deviates, than non-changers. Concern for parental and social authority indicates field dependence; anti-intraception indicates a redistribution of perceptual energy in the service of primitive beliefs; condemnation of social deviates indicates moral involvement. Each is theoretically related to reinforcement needs.

The Persuasibility Scale developed by the author differs considerably from the one developed by the Yale group. The Yale researchers were working on the assumption that persuasibility was a personality trait that oriented the organism toward his field for evaluations of reality, apparently without regard for authority figures. My theory, however, rejects the notion that any person can be oriented to reality in any but authoritative ways--all orientation proceeds through selective exposure performed by authority figures. A field dependent person simply invests authority in whomever enters his psychological field. While a paranoid schizophrenic limits his authority figure to one person, the field dependent person relates diffusely to authority, investing in practically anyone who happens to come along. It is suggested that the responsiveness that characterizes hypnosis emanates from this condition. In my scale, I attempt to account for this deficiency by including modifying clauses about orientation to authority:

Instructions: circle the response that comes closest to describing your real behavior.

1. Do you usually agree with the articles that you read in the newspapers and magazines you respect most?

Very Often Fairly Often Sometimes Seldom Never

2. How often do you change your opinion when you discover that most of your good friends do not share your point of view?

3. When your best friend wants to convince you of his own point of view, does he usually have a hard time or an easy time?

4. As compared with the average person your own age, how much are you influenced by the ideas expressed by those closest to you?

5. How often do you become uneasy when the opinion of a respected friend is different from your own on some important topic?

6. When your closest friend criticizes your ideas or objects to your opinions, how often do you end up feeling that he is right and you are wrong?

This scale was scored from 1-5, and with an n of 57, had a coefficient of reproducibility of .83.

Affective involvement, it will be remembered, represented the quality of involvement of an organism with another, and meant simply that the relationship was more important than any of the specific values that might flow from the relationship. The closest thing to it is love. Involvement was measured by the use of a seven item Involvement Scale:

1. Prior to coming to college, did you spend a lot of time figuring out just how much it would profit you in the future?

2. It has often been said "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." Applying that maxim to your own

relationships with members of the opposite sex, would you say you agree or disagree with it?

3. When a good friend asks you out for an evening, how often do you weigh the value of an evening out against the value of spending that time in another way, say studying or in other recreation?

4. When a person exhibits interest in having you as a friend, how often do you ask yourself whether or not the relationship will be worthwhile to you before going ahead?

5. Some people will not vote for a political candidate unless they are sure he is the best man for the country, free of corruption, and trustworthy. How often do you make decisions of this kind on such grounds?

6. How often do you evaluate your friends for what they give you rather than whether or not you like them?

7. Some people will not give their support to a political candidate unless they are sure he is going to do something that will benefit them directly. How often do you give your support on this basis?

The Involvement Scale, with an n of 57, had a coefficient of reproducibility of .80. When the Persuasibility and Involvement Scales were combined, the coefficient of reproducibility declined to .75.

2. Perceptual Avoidance Need. The need to avoid reality perceptually was measured by combining all those factors from Cattell's 16 Factor Personality Inventory that were classified in Chapter III as perceptual approach-avoidance traits. They included:

Perceptual

Approach	Avoidance
Praxernia	Autia
Comention	Abcultion
Harria	Presmia
Zeppia	Coasthenia
Shrewdness	Naivete
Radicalism	Conservatism

My argument is simply that perceptual avoidance may be measured by the perceptual skill traits that the organism has developed to facilitate or retard contact with reality. I assume that skill traits do not develop unless they are functional for the organism, an assumption required by learning theory.

3. Proximal Needs. Proximal, as opposed to distal, needs were measured by a scale containing fifteen open-ended items. If responses indicated a proximal perception of the group, they were scored 1; if not, they were scored 0. The individual item scores for each respondent were summed, deriving to total score for each respondent that was employed in calculations. Proximal perception of the group was judged to exist when any of the following attributes were indicated:

1) of all group memberships, the club was most important,

2) social, as well as political values were derived from interaction,

3) a respondent's tie with a primary figure (best friend, husband or wife, girl friend) was through the club,

4) a predominant number of close friends (over 50%) were members of the club, indicating that the club was the focus for intense interaction,

5) parents had been alienated from the members, creating absence of or weak family ties.

The following are the items and paradigm responses:

1. Which of the groups to which you belong would you say is most important to you; that is, which would be most difficult to give up if you had to drop one?

   "Socialists" (1)

   Why is that?

   "Well, I like its philosophy and some of my best friends belong to the club also." (1)

2. What do you like most about the club's activities?

   "I like the meetings."

   Why those particular activities?

   "We have a chance to discuss things and socialize a little." (1)

3. When you have informal meetings of your club, what do you do? Talk, argue, hear speeches, drink, play? What?

   "All of those things." (1)

4. What would you say is the primary purpose of such informal meetings? Is it social or political?

"Both."

How do you mean?

"Well, we discuss politics or listen to speeches, then we have a bull session or drink." (1)

5. Do the same people attend over and over, or are they different from meeting to meeting?

"They are always the same, but there are always new people."

How do you account for that?

"Well, those who are really interested in the club or hold offices attend all the time. Others come just to see what it is like." (0)

6. Do you spend a lot of time with any particular individual in your club?

"Yes."

Who?

"My girl friend." (1)

What is his (her) position in the club?

"She is secretary right now." (1)

7. What do you do when you get together?

"Oh, the usual thing I guess."

What do you talk about? Politics, sex, sports? What?

"Just about everything--we begin with politics and usually get around to sex." (1)

8. What do you like most about this person?

"Well, she is my girl friend--she is pretty sharp and she likes me." (1)

9. What do you like least about him (her)?

"She is too serious most of the time." (1)

10. What do you think he (or she) likes about you?

"We are interested in the same things--socialism, and we have a lot of fun." (1)

11. On the whole, would you say that he (she) is better informed on most things than you are? Or is she less informed?

"She is more informed about politics and school, but I know more about sports and other things. You know, about life." (1)

12. About how many friends do you have? Just a rough estimate?

"Twenty to thirty."

How many of these would you characterize as "close" friends?

"About five."

What percentage of all your friends are in the club?

"About five."

What percentage of your close friends are in the club?

"All of them." (1)

13. How many different clubs have you belonged to since your arrival on campus?

"Just those I have mentioned."

Why do you belong to so few (many)?

"I haven't had time to join more." (0)

14. Why did you join your political club? Was it pretty much your own idea or did you join at someone else's request?

"Well, my girl friend got me interested, but I do agree with socialism as a philosophy."

But why did you join? What was your immediate purpose?

"Oh, I guess I was curious about the club, but mostly it was because of her." (1)

15. Do your parents approve of your present political activities?

"I suppose they do. I don't think they really care."

Why?

"My dad doesn't care, as long as I stay out of trouble and my mother is a little worried, though--I guess she thinks that it might reflect on dad and his job." (0)

Where an item yielded more than one positive score, the additional score was ignored. The principle was one score per item, even though the score could have been derived at several points in the subquestioning. Instead of a score of 14, if every score were counted, this respondent had a score of 12.

4. Redistribution of Perceptual Energy. The extent to which perceptual energy had been redistributed in the service of primitive beliefs was measured by asking the respondent, after having taken a position on a Likert-type cognitive item, to marshal whatever evidence he could in defense of his position. My reasoning was that if primitive beliefs have been made particularly salient by redistribution, there should be a predominant concern with evaluation and a lack of attention to factual data. Respondents were asked to perform these operations on twenty items, each item providing six response spaces. For example:

1. Most men are basically evil. 1 2 3 4 5 6
(agree) (disagree)

a) "humanitarianism of the Cuban revolutionary
b) government."
c) "Decline of racial violence in South."
d)
e)
f)

Each response was examined and classified as being either factual (f) or evaluative (e). Then, the total number of each was divided into the total number of responses, deriving a percentage of factual and evaluative responses. The percentage then became raw scores for computational purposes.

5. Ego Strength. Ego strength was measured by the derivation of a twenty-three item "yes-no" scale designed

to tap each of the four parameters of ego strength, as well as self-esteem. Most of the items were taken from Cattell's 16 Factor Inventory.

I. Self-Control

1. Do you generally have enough energy at times when you need it most? Yes

2. I can always change old habits without difficulty and without relapse. Yes

3. Do you sometimes get exasperated with small rules and regulations, of which, in calmer moments, you approve? No

4. I often say things on the spur of the moment that I later regret. No

5. Do quite small setbacks sometimes irritate you unduly? No

II. Other-Control

6. Do you find it difficult to take no for an answer when it is obviously impossible to do what you want? No

7. Are you like the man in the story who often says "I'll bet you anything I'm right!" when someone argues with him? No

8. If a person behaves in a dictatorial and domineering manner do you (a) <u>simply avoid him</u>, (b) seek an occasion to have it out with him?

9. Do you get annoyed when you are jostled by people in the halls? No

10. If you are convinced that a person is unfair or intolerant, do you try to show him up, even if it costs you a lot of trouble? No

11. When I associate informally with my professors, I feel ill at ease. No

12. When my father disagrees with me about politics or religion, I am inclined to argue with him. No

III. Intraception

13. Do your emotions sometimes make you seem unreasonable, even to yourself? Yes

14. Do you think a lot about the mistakes you have made? Yes

15. I spend a lot of time trying to figure out why I do the things I do. Yes

IV. Perceptual Orientation

16. Do you find it hard to think about a problem because all different kinds of things come into your mind? No

17. Do you make special plans whenever possible to avoid waste of time between jobs? Yes

18. When reading something difficult, does your mind wander? No

19. Do you spend a lot of time thinking about what might have been? No

20. Do you frequently get in a state of tension and turmoil when thinking over the day's happenings? No

21. Do you have a period of feeling grouchy when you just don't want to see anyone? (a) very rarely (b) always.

V. Self-Esteem

22. My ideas cannot always be put easily into words, so I cannot jump into a conversation as readily as some people do. No

23. Are you so sure of yourself that you also inspire confidence in others? Yes

With an n of 57, the coefficient of reproducibility for this scale was .88.

6. Marginality. Marginality has been measured by fifteen open-ended items that were scored in the same manner as the items of the Proximal/Distal Scale. Marginality is not a quality that can be directly observed, for it depends upon the perception of the organism. Some persons can face conditions of instability with few perceptual consequences. Like the physicist looking for an atom, I am in the position of having to locate marginality by discovering its traces in the organism's current behavior. Marginality was judged to be present when any of the following attributes were encountered in responses:

1) excessive movement in the environment (roomatitis, movement in childhood and adolescence, parental unemployment),

2) excessive change in the number of current personal relationships,

3) difficulty in dating, conformance to norms,

4) change in levels of activity and performance from high school to college.

1. Do you have a room-mate?

   "Yes, two"

   Is he (she) the only one you have had?

   "No, I had two at the dorm in WSU. One was a complete stranger and the other is my closest friend."

   How many have you had?

   "A total of six" (If two or more, score 1)
   (By inference, he lost two while at Washington)

2. On the whole, do you find college to be a pretty friendly place or do you feel relatively lost?

   "lost" (1)

3. What is your accumulative GPA?

   "1.78" (If below 2.5, score 1)

4. What was it in high school?

   "2.19, I think" (If higher than now, score 1)

5. Have you ever changed majors?

   "Yes, first it was philosophy, then English, then Art for one day." (If more than once, score 1)

6. How often do you date?

   "Oh, once a month. Actually, that is misleading because I have a steady girl, which I don't count. I am talking about the other girls I take out."
   (If less than once a week, score 1)

7. Would you say that is an increase, a decrease or about the same as high school?

   "A definite increase. I never dated anyone in high school." (If a decrease, score 1)

8. Many college students experience difficulty in dating. How difficult is it for you?

"Quite difficult." (1)

Why is that?

"I'm pretty bashful, and I have an inferiority complex."

9. During your adolescence, during high school, was your father ever unemployed?

"Yes"

How often?

"Three times" (If more than two, score 1)

10. Did your family move around a lot during this period?

"Yes"

How often?

"Several cross country moves." (If more than once, score 1)

11. Did you get along well with the other kids in your neighborhood?

"No. I was constantly in fights." (1)

12. This is usually a very difficult period for young people with respect to dating and sex. How difficult was it for you?

"Not as difficult as college."

13. How about your adjustment in high school--were you pretty much in step with what other kids did or were you out of step?

"Out of step." (1)

14. Did your mother have to work during this period?

"Yes" (1)

15. Have you felt like changing religions during this period?

"No"

Typed by

Shirley Lerman
361 Beach 69th Street
Arverne 92, New York

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
3 5025 03403 1951

JA
76
M6